

# **EXHIBIT 62**

## **REDACTED**

Message

**From:** Aparna Pappu ([REDACTED]@google.com)  
**Sent:** 11/21/2014 4:57:07 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@google.com  
**CC:** Scott Spencer ([REDACTED]@google.com)  
**Subject:** Re: Per-buyer dynamic reserve price optimization on AdX - full launch

Yup - checked in with [REDACTED] - he is ooo next week so we're going to find a slot in Dec to come to SSR - this also gives the team time to agree on [REDACTED]

On Fri, Nov 21, 2014 at 11:54 AM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
FYI again. The teams are iterating on some technical proposals for [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

This is technical work, and I believe it is proceeding without any non-technical blockers.

Let me know if you have concerns.

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 8:55 AM, Aparna Pappu <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
No issue for me on the adsense pubs - that's between you and [REDACTED] - just wanted to let you know that adsense was in the loop.

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 11:54 AM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Awesome thanks.

I asked [REDACTED] to start discussion about whether AW can be exempted on AS pubs. If you prefer to handle that differently, that's fine too.

I'll see if I can get some consensus on the [REDACTED] question today.

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 8:50 AM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
We've been keeping [REDACTED] in the loop for AdSense pubs.  
I spoke to [REDACTED] - we'll bring this to an [REDACTED] ASAP

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 11:10 AM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
A couple of weekend updates -

There are some technical debates ongoing about [REDACTED].

I just understood that this change is being proposed for AdSense pubs. I don't understand why this would be necessary. For AdSense pubs, if there is a reason to do this, can we exclude AdWords Display buyers - it is a different relationship already, so do we need to be as "neutral" there?

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 6:24 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
No worries - thanks for the transparency [REDACTED]!

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 9:19 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
And once again - just in case I am making you nervous.

I may not agree here but I am not trying to be obstructionist. Regardless of the outcome I am committed to resolving these questions quickly!

If you remain committed to this launch, I don't need to like the decision in order to respect your goals and reasons.

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 4:15 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

I'd like to get a real VP approval, rather than a light weight PA bit flip. We can communicate that in various ways.

If they are OK with using bids, I can live with it. If I had \*your\* job, I would not launch this - I would use clearing price instead. But I am not obliged to evaluate this as rigorously.

On Nov 14, 2014 3:13 PM, "Aparna Pappu" <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

This is a publisher centric product - far less publisher centric than any of our competitors.

If I understand correctly you're saying you need VP approval before you flip the flag is that accurate?

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 5:27 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

So here are the main points:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

For what it is worth, I think it is a bad decision. We will start incentivizing buyers to reduce bids, because they know that every penny by which they bid over the minimum to win, they will be penalized in future auctions. It does not matter much for AdWords Display, but it may hurt revenue from 3rd party buyers in the long run.

On Tue, Nov 11, 2014 at 11:04 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

Thanks yeah it was a last minute GDN calendar add [REDACTED] did not add till yesterday. You guys are not the long pole the usual culprits were - sorry if I implied otherwise. Given holiday season wanted to get this done sooner.

On Nov 11, 2014 3:48 PM, "[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

On Tue, Nov 11, 2014 at 3:20 PM, Aparna Pappu <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

This has been in wait mode for a long time can we get [REDACTED] to look before Thursday?

FYI - Nirmal is the TL on this. [REDACTED] is not on the invite. The meeting is currently { [REDACTED] [REDACTED] }. Just in case you were worried that [REDACTED] is a big single point of failure. Your teams can always treat [REDACTED] as the main POC; he will escalate as he needs to and otherwise he has my full confidence.

If you wanted [REDACTED] for your own reasons, we can work something out. But you will run afoul of ACLS.

If you have been waiting for us, I apologize. The quality calendar was added yesterday, and that is first time I appeared in the approval chain. If there was some other communication I missed or my team was slow to respond to, I will try to address it. You know we try to be diligent, but if we are causing unnecessary slowdowns that is a real problem for me.

The Thursday meeting was scheduled by [REDACTED]. I have no objection if they can reschedule earlier.

So if more tweaks are needed they can be done this week.

On Nov 11, 2014 6:00 PM, "[REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@google.com>" wrote:  
Hi Scott, Aparna;

The sync up with the gTrade team is this Thursday (11/13). I would like to hold off the bit flip until they have had a chance to comment. Likely they will ask for at least a [REDACTED] experiment and possibly some fail-safe measures if models go weird.

It is possibly, but not likely, that there will find a more serious concern. I don't expect it, but I would like to let the process run cleanly.

Sound good?

On Tue, Nov 11, 2014 at 12:00 PM, [REDACTED]<[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
[REDACTED],

Can you glance at / flip the bit for the per-buyer RPO AdX launch? We added your calendar but i need all the bits flipped before approving.

[REDACTED]

Thanks!

--  
[REDACTED]

--  
[REDACTED]